UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---------------------|---------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/798,891 | 03/12/2004 | Russell Smith | 8618-USA | 4903 |
| 31743 PATENT GRO | 7590 03/02/200 UP GA030-43 | EXAMINER | | |
| GEORGIA-PAG | | CHRISS, JENNIFER A | | |
| ATLANTA, GA | EE STREET, N.E. A 30303-1847 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 1794 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 03/02/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|--------------------|--------------|--|
| 10/798,891 | SMITH ET AL. | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | |
| JENNIFER A. CHRISS | 1794 | |

| | JENNIFER A. CHRISS | 1794 | |
|---|--|--|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appear | ars on the cover sheet with the | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED 18 February 2009 FAILS TO PLACE THIS A | APPLICATION IN CONDITION FO | OR ALLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | the same day as filing a Notice of eplies: (1) an amendment, affidav al (with appeal fee) in compliance | Appeal. To avoid abar it, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ad no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b) MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | Ivisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailin b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN TH | g date of the final rejectio | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the slipset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply orig | of the fee. The appropria inally set in the final Office | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| 2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c) They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or | sideration and/or search (see NC v); | TE below); | |
| (d) They present additional claims without canceling a c NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)). | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | | empliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowed non-allowable claim(s). | | timely filed amendmer | nt canceling the |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | ll be entered and an ex | xplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appe | al and/or appellant fails | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | | • | |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet. | , | n condition for allowand | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (l13. ☐ Other: | P10/58/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /J. A. C./ Examiner, Art Unit 1794 | /Ula C Ruddock/ Primary Examiner, Art l | Jnit 1794 | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): the Double Patenting Rejections as detailed in paragraphs 8 - 9 of the Office Action dated January 5, 2009 are withdrawn and the cancellation of claims 21 - 29 renders the rejection as being unpatentable over Randall in view of Ali as moot and thus is withdrawn for claims 21 - 29 only.

Continuation of 11. Applicant's arguments are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Deodhar et al. is directed to coatings for paper facers while Randall et al. teach away from the use of paper facers. It should be noted that Deodhar et al. is not limited to paper facers and is relied upon for teaching the use of the particle coating of Deodhar et al. that is applied to the facer material of Randall in view of Ali. Additionally, it should be noted that Deodhar et al. teach that the particle size is such that a minimum of 99.9% passes through 100 mesh U.S. standard screen and a minimum of 85% passes through a 325 mesh U.S. screen (see claim 7). Therefore, the particle requirements of Randall et al. can be met by the particles of Deodhar et al. The Examiner relies on Deodhar et al. to teach a suitable coating having porosity to prevent trapped air from creating pinholes on the surface of a gypsum board. The Examiner submits that sufficient motivation and reasonable expectation of success is provided by the applied art. The rejections are maintained.